REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Amendments to the Specification

Pages 1 and 2 of the specification have been amended to update the list of co-pending applications with USPTO serial numbers.

Claim Objections

We believe the claims as revised overcome the objections raised. In this regard, we note claim 20 of our previous response did refer to "print" not "prints", although this may not have been clear from the formatting used.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In paragraphs 2 to 14 the Examiner objects to the claims on the basis of a variety of prior art documents. In view of these objections, the claims have been revised to further distinguish the claims from the prior art.

In particular, claim 14 has been amended to include the features of previously dependent claims 17 and 18 which have now been cancelled from the application.

In particular, the combination now set out in the claims refers to a device which allows a user to interact with a human discernible interface surface provided on a substrate. In view of this, the claim has been revised to clarify that the device is not per se "a viewing device" but rather a device which also allows interaction.

In this regard, the claim now specifies that the display device outputs visual information responding to at least part of the human discernible surface interface. In addition to this, the claim now requires that the device is provided with the user interface and control means operable to cause the printing mechanism to print markings on the substrate based partially on the user input, thereby allowing the user to interact with the part of the human discernible interface.

Thus, this clarifies that the device is adapted to provide visual display of visual information representing part of the human discernible interface. The user, using the appropriate user interface, is then able to interact with the displayed part of the discernible interface by providing inputs which are subsequently printed on the substrate to thereby complete the interaction.

Thus, as will be appreciated by the Examiner, the claim is now restricted to a manner of operation which allows a user to interact with portions of an interface, for example by providing inputs as shown in Figure 27. In particular, this allows a portion of the interface to be displayed on the screen and have the user provide inputs based on the display interface portion. The device then prints the input markings provided by the user on the interface, thereby allowing the interface, such as a form, to be completed.

We respectfully submit that the claim as revised and this mode of operation is not disclosed by any of the prior art.

In particular, in the Examination Report the Examiner has objected to claims 17 and 18 in view of a combination of Wilz Sr, Tsutsumoto et al and Goodwin et al. We respectfully submit that this combination of documents does not teach this particular combination of features.

In particular, while Wilz Sr does describe a viewing device which allows coded data to be detected and visual information to be presented, there is no disclosure of the visual information corresponding to at least a part of a human discernible interface. Furthermore, there is no disclosure in this document of allowing a user to provide inputs relating to the interface and then have these printed on the document.

Whilst we appreciate that a printer is described in Tsutsumoto et al, and that a input interface is described by Goodwin, we do not believe that the combination of the teaching of these documents renders it obvious to display a visual information corresponding to a part of the human discernible interface, such that the device shows a part of the interface which is also printed on the substrate. In addition to this, even if this is taught, it is not suggested that a user be able to provide written inputs, or the like, using an input device and then use these to cause corresponding printing to be performed on the interfac surface. Instead, it would be typical for this to be performed directly by having a user interact with the interface surface using a pen or the like.

However, the present invention allows a number of advantages to be obtained, such as allowing user inputs to be transferred to another computing device to allow the form filling to be performed both in a printed form, at the current location, and in an electronic format, remote locations or the like.

This provides a significant number of benefits which are not taught or suggested by the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 14 to 16 and 19 to 25, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:

PAUL LAPSTUN

KIA SILVERBROOK

TOBIN ALLEN KING

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
T lephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762